	1 2	BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION CERETARIAT
174 (2) (2) (2) (3)	3 4 5 6 7	In the Matter of) MUR 5590 MUR 5590 WILSON FOR CONGRESS) CASE CLOSURE UNDER THE ENFORCEMENT PRIORITY SYSTEM)
	8 9	SENSITIVE
	10	GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT
	11	Under the Enforcement Priority System, matters that are low-rated
	12	and are deemed inappropriate for review by the Alternative Dispute Resolution
	13	Office are forwarded to the Commission with a recommendation for dismissal. ¹ The
	14	Commission has determined that pursuing low-rated matters compared to other higher rated
	15	matters on the Enforcement docket warrants the exercise of its prosecutorial discretion to
	16	dismiss these cases.
	17	The Office of General Counsel scored MUR 5590 as a low-rated matter. In this case
. 44	18	the respondents appear to have timely reported the expenditure at issue in the complaint. In
	19	light of the de minims nature of the allegations and reviewing the merits of MUR 5590 in
	20	furtherance of the Commission's priorities and resources relative to other matters pending on
	21	the Enforcement docket, the Office of General Counsel believes that the Commission should
	22	exercise its prosecutorial discretion and dismiss the matter. See Heckler v. Chaney, 470 U.S.
	23	821 (1985).
	24	

¹ This Office conferred with the Alternative Dispute Resolution Office and concluded the matter was inappropriate for further review.

Case Closure Under EPS – MUR 5590 General Counsel's Report Page 2 of 2

RECOMMENDATION

1

TOTO CITY OLD

32

4 the appropriate letters. Closing the case as of this date will allow CELA and General	2	The Office of General Counsel recommends that the Commission dismiss MUR	
and Advice the necessary time to prepare the closing letters and the case file for the record. James A. Kahl Deputy General Counsel Gregory R. Baker Special Counsel Complaints Examination Legal Administration Jeff S. Jondan Supervisory Attorney Complaints Examination Legal Administration Legal Administration	3	5590, close the file effective two weeks from the date of the Commission vote, and approve	re
James A. Kahl Deputy General Counsel BY: Gregory R. Baker Special Counsel Complaints Examination Examination Legal Administration James A. Kahl Deputy General Counsel Complaints Examination Legal Administration Legal Administration Legal Administration Legal Administration	4	the appropriate letters. Closing the case as of this date will allow CELA and General Law	
James A. Kahl Deputy General Counsel BY: Gregory R. Baker Special Counsel Complaints Examination Reliable Legal Administration Supervisory Attorney Complaints Examination & Legal Administration & Legal Administration & Legal Administration	5	and Advice the necessary time to prepare the closing letters and the case file for the public	;
James A. Kahl Deputy General Counsel BY: Gregory R. Baker Special Counsel Complaints Examination Examination Examination Examination Jeff S. Jordan Supervisory Attorney Complaints Examination & Legal Administration Legal Administration & Legal Administration Legal Administration	6	record.	
James A. Kahl Deputy General Counsel BY: Gregory R. Baker Special Counsel Complaints Examination & Legal Administration James A. Kahl Deputy General Counsel BY: Gregory R. Baker Special Counsel Complaints Examination & Legal Administration Legal Administration & Legal Administration	7		
	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	Deputy General Counsel Gregory R. Baker Special Counsel Complaints Examination & Legal Administration Jeff S. Jordan Supervisory Attorney Complaints Examination & Legal Administration	
29 Attachment: 30 Narrative in MUR 5590 31	30		

30

1 2 3 4 5 **MUR 5590** 6 7 **Complainant:** Aaron R. Houston, Director for Americans for Medical Marijuana 8 9 10 **Respondents:** Heather Wilson for Congress & David A. Archuleta, as Treasurer 11 12 CSI Aviation Services, Inc. 13 14 Allegations: The complainants allege that the Heather Wilson for Congress Committee 15 ("Committee") used a software program registered to CSI Aviation Services, Inc. (aka Charter Services) without reporting the disbursements associated for registering the 16 software. The complainants contend that the use of the software constituted an in-kind 17 18 prohibited contribution from Charter Services to the Committee. 19 20 Responses: The Committee and Charter Services submitted evidence that the software in question was properly paid for and reported to the Commission. The software at issue 21 22 was apparently run from computers that were leased to the Committee by Charter Services on October 11, 2004 and returned to Charter Services on November 5, 2004. 23 24 The date of the disbursement by the Committee is listed as November 22, 2004, as reflected on its Post-General disclosure report that was filed on December 2, 2004. The 25 expenditure was reported as costing the Committee \$380. 26 27 28 Date complaint filed: October 29, 2004 29

Responses filed: November 26, 2004 and December 16, 2004